

September 4, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8275

"Work quickly and don't waste time on unimportant frills." That's Cooley's credo. He performs heart transplants in about two hours, while other surgeons have taken up to eight hours. His assistants prime the life-sustaining heart-lung machine with sugar and water instead of whole blood. This eliminates waiting weeks or even months for enough of the right type blood, and it reduces incidences of blood pooling, hepatitis, and kidney and liver complications.

The Cooley team works so fast surgeons make no effort to keep the donor heart "alive" during transplantation by circulating blood through it. In the past heart specialists felt this would damage the organ. "We allow the heart to relax and become quiescent," Cooley says. "It starts right up when connected to the patient's circulation." Other surgeons frown on these techniques. Cooley's answer to their criticism: "It's hard to argue with success."

The King of Hearts also introduced a new miracle drug to heart transplantation. Ironically, Louis Washkansky, the world's first heart transplantee, died as a result of medication given to prevent his body from rejecting the new heart. The body sees a new organ as foreign tissue, and immediately natural defenses attack it the way they would a harmful disease-producing agent. Drugs used to reduce these defenses also leave the body unprotected against an invasion of viruses and bacteria. Thus defenseless, Washkansky and other transplantees have lost their battle for survival to overwhelming infection.

Dr. Thomas Starzl of the University of Colorado, Denver, pioneered the development of a serum to prevent rejection of a transplanted organ without crippling the defenses needed to fight infection. Called antilympocyte globulin (ALG), the serum was used by Starzl on kidney transplants, and 19 out of 20 of them have survived a year or more. Cooley saw the value of ALG, and Everett Thomas became the first heart transplant to receive it. Cooley feels that is one of the prime reasons for the high survival rates among his transplants.

The Texas surgeon stands 6 feet, 4 inches tall, has a receding hairline, blue eyes and the build of an athlete. One female reporter described him as "looking like a young prince." He radiates warmth and confidence and is tremendously popular, both at the medical center and outside. So many surgical nurses want to assist in his operations that they must be assigned on a rotating basis, and he is in constant demand as a speaker or guest at social functions.

Cooley usually arrives at work about 7:30 and goes straight to surgery. While he operates in one room, assistants prepare another patient in an adjacent room. All day long he goes back and forth, correcting a defect in a little girl's heart, implanting a spare part in an old man's heart, or replacing a diseased artery in a housewife or businessman.

Cooley brings his lunch in a paper sack. At noon he goes into a broom closet-size office overlooking operating room No. 1 to munch on a sandwich and pickles. "The most important thing is the pickle," he says. "They make civilization what it is."

He has a reputation of remaining cool and calm no matter how bad a situation gets. "Dr. Cooley always seems to have everything under control," remarks Mrs. Elaine Reavis, his personal secretary. In six years Mrs. Reavis has never seen him lose his cool. "He uses his temper and doesn't let it use him," she says.

Cooley's attractive wife, Louise, who is from Frederick, Md., says she has only seen him mad once. Two years ago, while water-skiing behind a boat driven by Indianapolis "500" winner A. J. Foyt, he got too close to shore, riding over the lines of some fishermen and spraying them with water. When the boat came back in the other direction one of

the men took a shot at him with a hunting bow and arrow. "Denton was angry and I was scared," says Mrs. Cooley. "I shudder when I think what might have happened."

Cooley was born in Houston on Aug. 22, 1920. When he entered the University of Texas in Austin he intended to become a dentist like his socially prominent father. "I thought medicine would be too strenuous," he says.

The long, thin hands which are such an asset in surgery now were used to handle a basketball then, and Cooley's prowess on the court won him a place in the university's sports hall of fame. (His participation in campus free-for-alls and other "unauthorized activities," also assured him a place in the memory of most of his professors).

One weekend he went to San Antonio to see a friend who was an intern at the city-county hospital. Cooley visited him in the emergency area of the hospital one busy Saturday night after the arrival of a number of Mexicans who had been celebrating and violently disagreeing with each other. "I was permitted to handle the laceration and minor injury cases," he recalls, "and found I enjoyed the work very much. This experience, together with the good grades I received, made me decide I could meet the challenge of medicine."

On the recommendation of Dr. E. W. Berner, one of his professors who later founded the Texas Medical Center, Cooley entered the medical school at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. While there, he formed the friendship which led him into heart surgery.

One day he cut a clinic given by surgery professor Dr. Alfred Blalock in favor of playing tennis. Taking a short cut across the courts after class, Prof. Blalock spotted his absent student. "Rather than punish me," Cooley recalls, "he complimented me for my judgment in taking advantage of the rare good weather. A tennis player himself, he invited me to his home for the weekend."

Blalock talked Cooley into staying on the house staff after he received his medical degree in 1944. That same year Cooley assisted him in the first blue baby operation. In these infants, a birth defect involving the cardiovascular system results in a lack of oxygen which causes the fingers and toes to turn blue. "Dr. Blalock developed a revolutionary method of correcting this defect," says Cooley, "and I had the good fortune of helping him do the first 100 blue baby operations."

While at Hopkins he met Louise Thomas, a nurse from Frederick, Md. (Cooley refers to it as "Sleepy Hollow"). "Her father was a surgeon, and I thought she would make an ideal doctor's wife," he says. They were married in 1949 and now have five daughters, ranging in age from 7 to 18.

In 1951, while Cooley was working in London with one of the world's top heart surgeons, another great heart man, Dr. Michael DeBakey, invited him to come to Houston. Twenty different hospitals and research institutions had pooled their resources to form a unique \$140 million medical complex here. "Even if I had not been invited," he says, "I was determined to come back to this new Texas Medical Center."

The next five years saw the beginning of an exciting era in heart surgery. The heart-lung machine was invented, making open-heart surgery possible. At the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., Clarence Walton Lillehei was training two promising young surgeons, Christian Barnard and Norman Shumway. Shumway pioneered the techniques now used in heart transplantation and broke the barrier by announcing he was ready to perform the operation on humans.

In Texas, DeBakey and Cooley developed their own heart-lung machine, and pioneered a technique for replacing diseased arteries

with natural grafts and, later, dacron tubing. Cooley performed extremely delicate surgery on infants and small children.

Cooley first thought about heart transplants as early as 1948 when he transplanted a lung from one dog to another at Hopkins. He was still considering it and closely watching the results of work with animals when Barnard transplanted the first human heart in December, 1967.

"In retrospect," Cooley says, "I must give Chris Barnard all the credit I can. He made the breakthrough. I don't know if I'd have operated if Barnard had not done it first."

When he heard about the operation in South Africa, Cooley went into action immediately. He dispatched a team to the University of Colorado to learn as much as possible about ALG. Conferences and discussions were held. Techniques were perfected on animals; dress rehearsals conducted with cadavers.

"I'm apprehensive before any transplant operation," Cooley admits, "but, of course, on the first one the burden was heaviest. I had personal reservations because of subjecting the patient to something I was not sure of myself. It was a gamble."

Apprehension grew as the operation proceeded. Each suture—each connection—increased the pressure. I feared that the heart might be violently rejected. I knew that failure would be catastrophic for the community and the medical center.

"The pressure was tremendous as the last stitch was made. We removed the clamps and blood surged through the old vessels and into the new heart. When the heart began to beat, we knew we had a success. It was the greatest moment in my life."

The real moral issue in transplantation, he feels, is not whether or not you do the operation, but "whether or not you have the right to deprive someone of the means to prolong his life."

Cooley points out that many churches have come out in favor of transplants. "The heart, and all other organs in the body, are the servants of the brain, he told a meeting of clergymen. "Once the brain is gone, the heart should be free to serve other brains. If there is a place where the soul resides, it is in the brain."

SPECIAL REPORT ON THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE UNITED STATES-CANADA AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress a special report on the joint comprehensive review of the United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement. This review was undertaken by the Governments of the United States and Canada in accordance with the terms of the Agreement. A report to the Congress on the review is required by the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965.

In reviewing the Agreement, both Governments concluded that:

—Considerable progress has been made toward achieving the benefits of a broader United States-Canada market

H 8276

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 4, 1968

for automotive products. Trade between the two countries in automotive products has greatly expanded, cost economies in production have been realized, and employment in the automotive industries in both countries has increased.

—Not enough experience has been accumulated under the Agreement to recommend changes. Areas of possible improvement were carefully considered and are under further study.

Each Government continues to be able at any time to request consultations on any problem arising under the Agreement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 4, 1968.

BIRTHDAY OF CZECH REPUBLIC

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1968, I introduced in this House a resolution (H.J. Res. 1360) which would authorize the President to designate October 28, 1968, as the date commemorating the 50th anniversary of the proclamation of Czechoslovak independence from Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

While Congress was in recess for the national nominating conventions, Soviet troops—aided by forces from East Germany, Bulgaria, Poland, and Hungary—invaded Czechoslovakia and now occupy that nation in order to stifle the recent trend toward "democratization."

I believe that now, more than ever, House Joint Resolution 1360 should be passed. I say this for several reasons:

First. Most of the Communist leaders responsible for the trend of "democratization" are still in power, and, though challenged by the might of the Warsaw Pact, still maintain the loyalty of the majority of the Czechoslovaks.

Second. Because of the delicate diplomatic situation, it is both impossible and undesirable for the United States and the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to respond to the Soviet invasion with armed force. However, after publicly condemning this brazen and callous act we may further express our dissatisfaction with a public gesture by the American people by joining in the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Czech independence.

Third. The historical connection between Czechoslovakia and the United States is rooted in a common declaration of democratic ideals. President Woodrow Wilson's principles of representative government were admired and incorporated by the drafters of the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence, and the Republic's first president, Thomas G. Masaryk, chose Independence Hall, Philadelphia, the shrine of our own freedom, to proclaim his new nation.

Fourth. Czech and Slovak national groups in the United States are now preparing for the celebration of the 50th anniversary, and I believe that their efforts would be greatly enhanced by the support of all Americans as a reminder of the faith and support which we have for the cause of freedom in Czechoslovakia.

I hope that my colleagues will consider House Joint Resolution 1360 and press for its passage.

LET US BE FAIR

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, several suggestions have been made by Members of Congress of this and the other body that an investigation be made of the disorders and clashes in Chicago during the recent Democratic Convention.

Many of these statements have been made with an exclusively antipolice bias and I believe that fairness requires that the matter be put into perspective and the problem of the law-enforcement agencies be stated and understood.

First of all, I suggest that the affair is primarily a local matter, since it concerns the preservation of the public peace by local authorities in an intrastate setting. It is obvious, therefore, that the Congress, which is concerned with national matters, would not have jurisdiction over the operation of a local police department unless other factors were present.

Even if jurisdiction were to be found, however, any unbiased observer would agree that it would be unfair to direct such investigation solely against the police on the underlying assumption that they were the generators of the disturbances. Surely Mayor Daley and the police force did not want the damaging and bloody clashes which occurred and the conduct and activities of those who precipitated the conflicts should be placed on the scales against any supposed deficiencies on the part of the police.

If any investigation were to be made, I would suggest that it include an examination of the following items: The presence and role of Tom Hayden, founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, who masterminded the Columbia University debacle last spring; of David Dellinger, who was the moving force behind the attack on the Pentagon in October; and of Jerry Rubin, the leader of the Youth International Party.

The statements of these and other leaders of the radical left which clearly indicate an intention to disrupt the national convention in the city of Chicago with the eventual purpose of destroying our whole social fabric should be inquired into. The secret diary of the leader of the National Mobilization Committee with its revolutionary strategy clearly outlined should be examined, as well as the assassination plot directed against Vice President HUMPHREY.

In addition, the provocative, insulting, and intolerable conduct of many of the demonstrators with their howling of obscenities, with their reliance on and use of physical filth, their disregard for police and public regulations, and their courting of physical conflict should be fully evaluated.

Finally, alongside the injuries that may have been suffered by the demonstrators should be placed the 84 police-

men who were wounded in various degrees in their efforts to maintain public order and protect the delegates to the convention. Some were wounded with primitive weapons such as broken bottles and their injuries will be permanently disabling.

Some suggest that the convention might have been held in a different location and that this would have avoided the difficulties and tragedies. At first I agreed with this analysis, but after the Chicago experience I have come to the conclusion that those leaders who sparked the trouble in Chicago would have been in Miami or Honolulu or any other place and their supporters and brawlers would have been with them in very substantial numbers and, therefore, that similar disturbances would have been created regardless of the site of the convention. Then I asked myself the basic philosophical question, and that is, should elements of the revolutionary left be able to tell the Democratic Party and the city of Chicago that the convention of a great national party cannot be held in that noted city? I suggest that the question answers itself.

As a final point it should be emphasized that there was no racial element involved in the demonstrations. They were to a disturbing degree classical and disruptive revolutionary tactics directed at disorganizing the effective functioning of the American political system.

I want to make it clear that I in no way condone the use of unnecessary force by enforcement authorities and I have no doubt that this was used in some cases, particularly against the communications operatives. Nor do I wish to restrain dissidents from expressing their points of view, however contradictory to mine they may be. At the same time the proposition that the Democratic Party and the city of Chicago should submit to the dictation of disruptive and subversive forces is untenable to me.

Innumerable commentators have testified as to what happened and I include some of their comments herewith.

Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson made the following statement:

But the New Left, according to the intelligence report, wanted to rampage in the streets and force a confrontation with the police. The repercussions around the world, they argued, would demonstrate the strength of peace forces and help North Vietnamese negotiations in Paris.

This was exactly what happened. The militants staged a peace rally which was never intended to be peaceful. They waved red flags, shouted obscenities, and deliberately provoked clashes in front of TV cameras.

Ralph McGill in his column wrote as follows:

It can be argued that the police and guardsmen were over-zealous. But it is also true that they had been subjected to barages of rocks, bottles and other missiles also. When law forces are charged by very active and muscular young men, it is difficult not to respond. At any rate, their orders were to prevent takeover of the hotel or the Amphitheater where the convention was being held.

The main leaders of the youth group were those who had staged the massive protest